

870225-9
Dee Marshall

new

Oakland Redevelopment Agency

REPORT ON AMENDING THE
OAKLAND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JAN 6 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

June 12, 1975

81 02259

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG - 8 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY HAS APPROVED PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT ONLY FOR CITIZEN'S DISCUSSION. IT HAS NOT APPROVED THE SUGGESTED PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS. THE AGENCY WILL MAKE ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY MANAGER AND CITY COUNCIL FOLLOWING THE COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING(S).

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

- The Participation Process

II. CD POLICY OVERVIEW

- Citizens' Views
- Legislative Conformity
- Geographic Distribution

III. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO 1975 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

- Overview of Recommended Changes

IV. SUMMARY OF FUNDING REQUESTS

- Types of Programs
- Geographic Distribution
- Dollars Requested
- Recommendations

V. PROPOSED EVALUATION GUIDELINES

APPENDIX A: FUNDING ABSTRACTS

OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REPORT ON AMENDING THE
OAKLAND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

I. INTRODUCTION

In approving Oakland's Community Development (CD) application in February 1975, the Oakland City Council recognized that the application had been prepared under severe time pressures. The large volume of citizen interest expressed before and during the hearings merited more extensive consideration than time permitted if the application were to be submitted by the HUD deadline. For these reasons, the Council instructed the Redevelopment Agency to obtain additional citizen input and to draft a revised Community Development application for Council consideration. This public report is the outgrowth of that revision process. The report presents recommended revisions to the approved Community Development application, outlines policy considerations and evaluation criteria used in arriving at these proposed changes and presents a summary budget for the Community Development Program as a framework within which the Council may consider the recommended first year Community Development allocations.

The Participation Process

A concern during this amendment process was to achieve a more focused citizen input, shifting from general expressions at large general meetings to more considered recommendations by spokespersons who represented the broader variety of neighborhoods and interest groups that would be affected by community development.

Because of uncertainties about the structuring of the citizen participation process, some community groups which emerged to deal with Community Development issues have concentrated their attention more on organizational issues than on specific program recommendations. Despite efforts to deal with program questions, citizen participation issues predominated in the meetings.

Some misunderstanding also developed about the purposes of Community Development. Many funding requests from individuals and organizations were received. In these requests, there was a tendency to assume that Community Development was like the Alameda County Revenue Sharing program under which a sizable amount of funds is diverted to existing organizations providing social services. The intent of the Community Development Program, however, is to give primary emphasis to housing and community development

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON
FROM 1630 TO 1880

The history of the city of Boston is a story of growth and development. From a small fishing village in 1630, it grew into a major center of commerce and industry. The city's location on a natural harbor gave it a strategic advantage, and its proximity to the Atlantic Ocean made it a key port for trade with Europe and the West Indies. The city's early years were marked by hardship and struggle, but its resilience and determination led to its eventual success. The city's growth was fueled by its diverse population, which included people from many different backgrounds and cultures. This diversity helped to create a vibrant and dynamic community that was able to adapt to changing circumstances and embrace new opportunities. The city's history is a testament to the power of human ingenuity and the ability of a community to overcome adversity and build a better future for itself.

The city's growth was also driven by its role as a center of education and culture. The city was home to many of the most prominent universities and colleges in the country, and it was a hub for intellectual and artistic activity. The city's rich cultural heritage is reflected in its many museums, theaters, and historic landmarks. The city's history is a story of innovation and progress, and it continues to inspire and inform the city's development today. The city's location, its diverse population, and its commitment to education and culture have all contributed to its success and its status as one of the most important cities in the United States.

The city's history is a story of resilience and determination. Despite many challenges and setbacks, the city has always managed to overcome adversity and build a better future for itself. The city's growth and development have been the result of the hard work and dedication of its people, and its success is a testament to the power of human ingenuity and the ability of a community to overcome adversity and build a better future for itself. The city's history is a story of innovation and progress, and it continues to inspire and inform the city's development today. The city's location, its diverse population, and its commitment to education and culture have all contributed to its success and its status as one of the most important cities in the United States.

as a program administered by the local government. For this reason, recommended funding for social programs is limited to special situations that would support the main effort in housing and community development.

II. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT POLICY OVERVIEW

Community Development is a program which emphasizes housing programs and neighborhood environmental improvements assisted by economic and social programs in such a way as to provide maximum benefit to low- and moderate-income citizens. The central objective of the Agency's community development programming efforts has been to identify a combination of programs which has the most beneficial effect for the greatest number of people. Determining that proper combination of programs over the next six years is the task before this community. A local definition of the basic first-year program is, therefore, set forth here--for public debate and consideration by the Council.

Citizens' Views

On the basis of a great variety of public expressions at meetings in the past several years, citizens of Oakland appear to hold unified views on basic priorities. Those priorities are housing and jobs. It seems basically agreed that those programs which will improve the physical conditions in the City--the housing, streets and blighting influences--are appropriate, and that those programs should be conducted along with community facility improvements and economic/employment development programs. These views are in accord with the objectives defined in the legislation which then focus on eligible activities as outlined by the Housing and Urban Development Department of the Federal Government. Citizens may differ in their approach to the objectives. Some would place greater emphasis on housing improvements while others would stress job-creation and income-improving programs, or supporting social services. There is, nevertheless, a basic understanding that housing, environmental improvements and social service programs should be coordinated and integrated into a comprehensive Community Development Office.

Experience and historic practice in certain programs provides a basis for decision-making with respect to an acceptable combination of programs that will produce results. For example, some form of governmental financial and technical assistance for housing conservation is known and accepted as a desirable program. Further, it is assumed that some combination of housing and improvement programs can be implemented to generate jobs and revitalize neighborhoods at the same time.


Legislative Conformity

An important restriction on Oakland's selection of an appropriate mix of Community Development programs is the legislative requirement that social programs are eligible only in areas of concentrated housing and environmental program activity, and only if they cannot be funded by other agencies or departments of the Federal Government more directly concerned with those issues. For example, nutritional education programs are considered to be more appropriately funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare than by Community Development. Another example would be job-training programs which could be funded by the Department of Labor. In certain circumstances, however, social programs which have special merit or ones for which a special case could be made for an urgent unmet need, or one which would directly benefit a housing or environmental program would meet local eligibility criteria and some could be approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In addition to this limitation, HUD legislation implies a certain combination of programs in its list of eligible activities. That list is summarized in Section V entitled Proposed Evaluation Guidelines.

Geographic Distribution

Geographical distribution of funds within the City is also an important consideration. A Community Development Program should have as an important objective, the integration and distribution of those programs that would ensure a balanced utilization of programs between districts of the City where low- and moderate-income families and individuals live. It should be emphasized, however, that a simple arithmetic allocation is unlikely to be the most effective or efficient utilization of scarce Community Development resources, and trade-offs must therefore be made within the City and within the time period prescribed for a series of programs, say, over a five-year period. Oakland's distribution of funds should respect differences in need and potential for accomplishment. At the same time, there should be some assurance that citizens in specific areas of the City will have equal opportunity to secure rehab funds and combine those funds with environmental improvement projects and economic development programs which are being implemented there.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123308422>

III. RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO 1975 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Overview of Recommended Changes

A majority of the program components included in the approved Community Development Program continue to be recommended in this proposed revision (see chart below). These are programs for which there appears to be broad support and which are essential elements in achieving the program's objectives.

CHART 1

| <u>List of Unchanged Programs</u> | <u>(in thousands)</u> |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Housing Rehabilitation | \$5187 |
| Fruitvale/Central East Oakland Park* | 215 |
| Elmhurst Park | 365 |
| Lincoln Neighborhood Center | 200 |
| Mini-Park in NHS Program Area | 45 |
| East Oakland Revitalization | 189 |
| Stanford/Adeline Project | 111 |
| OCCUR-Central Staff- HUD | |
| Approved and First Action Year | 113 |
| Model Cities Continuation | 370 |

Most of the additional program components proposed to be added to the overall Community Development Program are either Council approved existing programs for which additional Community Development funding is needed (e.g., Chinatown Project Continuation) or actions on which there has been considerable Council or citizen discussion in the past (e.g., the Victorian Row Project and curb-ramping in the downtown area. Central District tax increment funds could provide reimbursement for any Community Development funds used for Chinatown, Victorian Row and Curb Ramping. The amended application also anticipates that communities will need certain neighborhood environmental improvements to support the housing and rehabilitation effort. All these additional programs are listed in Chart 2 which follows.

*The Central East Oakland District was formerly the Seminary District.

CHART 2

| <u>Additional Programs</u> | <u>(in thousands)</u> |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Chinatown | \$1,100 |
| Victorian Row | 300 |
| Neighborhood Environmental Im- | |
| provements | 700 |
| City-wide Cleanup | 300 |
| Social Service Programs | 500 |

In order to shift funds to provide money for new Community Development programs, Agency staff working with City staff re-evaluated the cost estimates contained in the approved application. A prime consideration here was whether funds initially allocated could actually be spent during the program year in view of the time that would be required to gear up certain programs and in view of the delays which environmental impact assessment would cause. As a result of this analysis, the program reductions shown in Chart 3 below have been recommended.

CHART 3

| <u>Reductions of Exist-</u> <u>ing Program Allocations</u> | <u>Approved</u> <u>Allocation</u> <u>(\$000)</u> | <u>Suggested</u> <u>Allocation</u> <u>(\$000)</u> |
|---|--|---|
| Pre-Sale Inspection | \$106 | -* |
| Code Enforcement and Acquisition | 548 | 307 |
| Oak Center Cultural House | 125 | 100 |
| Home Management Counseling | 245 | 150 |
| Headstart Extension | 326 | -** |
| Elmhurst Project | 1,316 | 600 |
| Moving Assistance | 604 | 418 |
| Planning & Administrative | 1,673 | 1,130 |
| Contingencies | 1,162 | 500 |

*Suggested revision assumes pre-sale inspection services would be sustained by fees.

**To be included in Social Services Program category.

In addition to changes in the funding of program components and the establishment of new activities, the recommended revision attempts to simplify the format for presenting the programs so that they are grouped according to the nature of the service or activity rather than by the Agency or department administering the activity. This reorganization of the programs results in the major categories shown in Chart 4 below.

CHART 4

Program

- A. ONGOING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
- B. HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS
 - a) Rehab Program
 - b) Supportive Services
- C. NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES
 - a) Environmental Improvements
 - b) Environmental Maintenance Services
- D. COMMUNITY FACILITIES
- E. HISTORIC PRESERVATION
- F. SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

The suggested budget, open for review and amendment is shown by the following budget summary.

SUGGESTED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUDGET SUMMARY

THE OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY HAS APPROVED PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT ONLY FOR CITIZEN'S DISCUSSION. IT HAS NOT APPROVED THE SUGGESTED PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS.

Community Development Grant for 1975-76 \$12,787,000

Suggested Funds Needed for Ongoing Community Development Programs:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Stanford/Adeline Project | \$ 111,000 | |
| Elmhurst Project | 600,000 | |
| Chinatown Project | 1,100,000 | |
| Model Cities Continuation | 370,000 | |
| Oak Center Cultural House | 100,000 | |
| Lincoln Neighborhood Center | <u>200,000</u> | <u>2,481,000</u> |

Funds Available for Suggested New Programs: \$10,306,000

HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS

Rehabilitation:

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Loan Program | \$4,668,000 |
| Program Costs | 519,000 |

Supportive Services:

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Code Enforcement, Acquisition and/or Demolition Program | 307,000 |
| Moving Assistance | 418,000 |
| Home Counseling-Fair Housing | <u>150,000</u> |

PRELIMINARY DRAFT
OAKLAND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

\$6,062,000

NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND SERVICES

Environmental Improvements:

| | |
|----------------------|---------|
| North Oakland | 100,000 |
| West Oakland | 100,000 |
| Central | 100,000 |
| San Antonio | 100,000 |
| Fruitvale | 100,000 |
| Central East Oakland | 100,000 |
| Elmhurst | 100,000 |

Environmental Maintenance Service:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| City-wide Cleanup | 300,000 |
| East Oakland Revitalization | <u>189,000</u> |

\$1,189,000

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Fruitvale/Central East Oakland Park | 215,000 |
| Elmhurst Park | 365,000 |
| Mini-park Elmhurst | <u>45,000</u> |

\$625,000

HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Victorian Row \$300,000

SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS \$500,000

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT* \$1,130,000 \$9,806,000

Allowance for Contingencies \$500,000

*Includes feasibility studies for neighborhood and community facilities.

Stanford/Adeline Project (\$111,000)

The Stanford/Adeline Project commenced in the first NDP Action Year, 1972-73. Approximately \$2.3 million of HUD categorical grant funds will be used in this project. The \$111,000 from Community Development funds is needed for site improvements in the second development area which will complete the new development sections of this project. The balance of the project, rehabilitation, will be completed through reliance upon the Community Development Rehabilitation Program.

Elmhurst Project (\$600,000)

This project also commenced in the 1972-73 NDP Action Year. It is presently estimated that \$1.9 million in HUD categorical grant funds will be used in this project. The 1975-76 Community Development request of \$600,000 is for continuing activities in the project. The major emphasis during 1975-76 will be the development of tennis courts in the expanded Elmhurst Park, acquisition and preparation of parking space on East 14th Street and rehabilitation loan funds for commercial structures. It is anticipated the project will be completed in 1980-81 and will need approximately \$3 million in additional Community Development funds.

Chinatown Project (\$1,100,000)

The Chinatown Project officially commenced during the 1972-73 NDP Year. HUD categorical grants of \$900,000 will be expended to complete activities on the initial block of the four-block project. The requested advance of \$1.1 million of Community Development funds will be applied towards the acquisition of selected parcels in the block bounded by 10th and 11th Streets between Broadway and Franklin Streets. It is estimated that an additional \$7.1 million will be required to complete the project. The ultimate source of funding the project would be the tax increments generated by the project. It is proposed that any Community Development funds used be returned for Community Development purposes.

Model Cities Continuation

This budget item provides for continuation of the following programs:

Project Compliance (\$227,000), under the direction of legal aid attorneys provides services in affirmative action, consumer protection, unemployment compensation and child support.

Progressive Senior Citizens (\$51,000) is an ongoing program serving approximately two hundred persons at the current funding level. It also provides part-time employment for elderly citizens who serve as program and community aides.

Parent-Child Development Center (\$29,000) operates five child care centers under one administration. The centers provide services for children between 2½ and 5 years old from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

St. Andrews Community Child Care Center (\$6,000) offers an educational environment for twenty-five children between the ages of 2.6 and 5.9 years and parents in the West Oakland area.

Model Cities Programs (\$57,000) is budgeted for administrative costs for the period May 1, 1975 through June 30, 1975.

Oak Center Cultural House Facility (\$100,000)

This budget item is necessary to complete rehabilitation costs for this facility, which has been funded by HUD in the amount \$83,944. A commitment has been made to the community for this facility which is an integral part of the Oak Center Project and has been approved as a location within the city-wide neighborhood facilities plan.

Lincoln Neighborhood Center (\$200,000)

Additional funds are required for this facility because the original grant from HUD does not adequately cover costs of construction. The \$200,000 will supplement initial funding in the amount of \$320,000.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS (\$6,062,000)

Housing conservation is widely perceived to be a priority program. Nearly half of the total first year Community Development funds are suggested for a rehabilitation loan fund and supportive services. A detailed program assigning funds to loans and loan guarantees, and a full range of rehabilitation programs is being designed. Supportive Services will include housing counseling, moving assistance and a program to attempt to conserve the kind of housing that, in the past, has been demolished through code enforcement.

Environmental Improvements (\$700,000)

Citizen organizations and neighborhood groups in the districts have identified a variety of needs for environmental improvements--street trees, curb and gutter repairs, landscaping or open areas and similar improvements. These improvements will upgrade the living environment and are essential to the success of the residential rehabilitation program. These proposed budget allocations would set aside funds for such activities during the first Community Development year. After precise proposals for specific

improvements have been developed through the joint efforts of district representatives; City staff and Oakland Redevelopment Agency staff, each proposal would be submitted to the City Council for approval and to HUD for authorization to commit funds.

Environmental Maintenance Service (\$489,000)

City-wide Cleanup (\$300,000). This program, which will be a concerted effort throughout the city over a period of three to six months, is designed to assist residents in cleaning up their neighborhoods. Included will be placement of drop boxes in all areas, removal of abandoned automobiles, cleaning of vacant lots, and in some areas, street sweeping to supplement present City services. Also, at individual owners' requests, staff services will be available for removal of unsightly sheds, fences, etc.

East Oakland Revitalization (\$189,000). The East Oakland area has a critical set of problems adversely affecting the creation of attractive, safe and convenient neighborhoods with good housing, viable business communities and adequate services. The \$189,000 requested under the Community Development Program, combined with \$587,000 of CETA funds will be utilized to bolster neighborhood security through additional security service, animal control and building security programs; to upgrade the physical environment through vacant residential building cleanup and security inspection, debris and garbage cleanup and weed clearance programs; to renovate and upgrade existing recreational and housing service programs.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES (\$625,000)

Fruitvale/Central East Oakland Park (\$215,000)

This park is included in the approved application for acquisition and development of a playground with a director's office and restrooms. It is to be located at Allendale and High Streets.

Elmhurst Park (\$365,000)

This park is included in the approved application for acquisition and development of a park to be located at 98th and Bancroft. It is scheduled to be a playground with a director's office and restrooms.

Mini-park in NHS Program Area (\$45,000)

This park is budgeted for development costs of a facil-

ity to be located at 98th and Holly in the Elmhurst District. A private donation of \$25,000 matching funds provides for site acquisition and design and development services.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Victorian Row (\$300,000)

The Victorian structures along 9th Street, between Washington and Broadway are of historical value and an important architectural resource for Oakland. It is proposed that the historically significant structures will be acquired and rehabilitated by a prospective master developer. The requested advance of \$300,000 from Community funds will initiate some preliminary acquisition activity. It is presently estimated that total project costs will be \$2.8 million with \$1.1 million to be realized in disposition proceeds. The ultimate source of funding the project would be the tax increments generated by the project. It is proposed that any Community Development funds used be returned for Community Development purposes.

SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS (\$500,000)

This suggested budget item would cover new requests for funds from organizations throughout the city ~~proposing to offer a variety of services supporting the Community Development effort in specific neighborhoods as well as city-wide special groups.~~ This budget item sets funds aside so that community groups will have an opportunity to discuss specific programs which may offer desired services in their neighborhoods. After precise proposals for specific programs have been developed through the joint efforts of district representatives, City staff and Oakland Redevelopment staff, each proposal would be submitted to the City Council for approval and to HUD for authorization to commit funds.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT (\$1,130,000)

Program Management includes the estimated costs to fund OCCUR, provide Agency staff support to the districts, plan for the subsequent years' Community Development activities and provide for the general administration of the Community Development Program.

CONTINGENCIES (\$500,000)

Provided in the proposal is \$500,000 for contingencies to cover unforeseen needs during the year which may include additional funds needed for approved activities or new programs.

IV. SUMMARY OF FUNDING REQUESTS

To date, forty-four program requests for Community Development funding have been submitted to the Mayor, City Council, City Manager and Redevelopment Agency Executive Director. These requests have been in the form of letters, annual reports and proposals. Some address funding needs of programs which are currently operating, while others express ideas and recommend ways to meet perceived needs in the community.

It has been generally agreed upon that citizen groups and individuals would have opportunities for input to the overall Community Development Program. No provision, however, was made in the approved application for such additional activities and programs. Neither has there been a policy or format agreed upon by the community, the Council and the Redevelopment Agency with respect to submission requirements. It would, therefore, be inappropriate at this time to reject many of these funding requests because they may be entirely appropriate and desirable once policy has been set and made available to applicants.

In addition to the wide range of type of sponsors, the type of programs suggested are random and in some cases multi-purpose. For example, one request is for subsidized rehabilitation funds for eight housing units for elderly citizens in a specific area of the City. Another proposes a combination of nutritional counseling, recreational activities, and housing unit construction. There is a clear difference between citizen input with respect to programs that would be conducted in conjunction with ongoing City functions, and requests for funding which are made by citizens operating or setting up independent programs.

Keeping in mind the above reservations, the following classifications give a general idea of the types of programs that are being suggested.

Seven propose Rehabilitation or Repair of buildings and facilities for various purposes--residential, nursery school, and educational activities. Three requests propose Neighborhood Environmental Improvements, some for curbs and gutters, some for street improvements (including ramping for handicapped persons) Two deal with Urban Renewal. Seven proposals speak to New Community Facilities, which request construction funds for parks, libraries, youth and multi-service centers. Twelve fall under the general category of Social and Community Services, for example juvenile delinquency prevention, child abuse and neglect, and programs for emotionally disturbed children. Three deal primarily with Work Experience and Job Training, especially as they might be coordinated with community development construction,

demolition, and rehabilitation activities. Two requests are concerned with Cultural Facilities. One combines historic preservation objectives with educational and recreational services. The other requests financial support for training and productions in the performing arts.

The North Oakland District Council submitted recommendations for allocation of Community Development funds early in the year. Their proposal addresses funding priorities and programmatic allocations on a community-wide basis within a three-year budget. The point to be made here is that this proposal speaks to programmatic issues.

Other programmatic recommendations for various organizations from East Oakland should be noted as well. One representative of Fruitvale, for example, presents a list of priorities which include programs of public works, residential rehabilitation for the Kennedy Tract-23rd Avenue, a program of new industry incentives, multi-purpose community service centers, health centers and bilingual child-care programs. Another representative cites traffic safety renovations and recreational facilities. Another group has submitted a detailed proposal that advocates \$5 million for comprehensive housing and rehabilitation programs in Oakland.

Geographic Distribution

Six programs propose to serve a city-wide area. Fourteen would serve citizens in East Oakland primarily. Seven programs are located in the Central District of the City; the majority of those would serve special populations such as the Chinese, the elderly and the handicapped. Nine requests focus on the West Oakland area. In addition to two separate programs located in North Oakland, as noted above, that community has requested specific amounts be allocated from city-wide programs, as well as for special neighborhood programs.

Dollars Requested

The dollar amounts requested range from \$671 to \$1,100,000. The total amount estimated to this date is \$6.4 million. It should be noted, however, that many requests did not specify an amount, gave alternative budgets, or simply gave maximum amounts needed.

Recommendations

In order to afford community groups an opportunity to discuss those programs which offer services either city-wide or in their own districts, this budget suggests that \$500,000 be set aside for new or special programs not included in the suggested

budget and program requests that fall in the category of Social Services. In addition to citizen's discussion of these programs, a percentage budget restriction and a comparative rating should allow for the most equitable allocation of program priorities. Delegate-sponsored funding requests should be considered in light of overall program priorities expressed in public meetings, and it is expected that this process will strengthen community support for those programs.

V. PROPOSED EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The following evaluation guidelines have been prepared to assist the citizens, the Council and the Community Development Agency as they rate newly proposed programs, as well as ongoing programs within community development.

The evaluation or rating criteria are grouped in four categories.

Category I, Policy Considerations, raises issues which are covered by the Federal legislation and regulation, the City Policy Plan, and what should become a locally agreed upon definition of appropriate activities under a Community Development Program.

Category II, Factual Considerations, raises questions about Cost Effectiveness, Track Record, and similar questions of ability to deliver services and show results.

Category III, Budget Review, involves questions of budgeting, time considerations and priorities. The process involved here is very complex, one which requires a series of comparisons between total program budget allocations and individual program costs.

Category IV, Subjective Considerations, includes the less easily quantified considerations like relationship, impact or benefit of one program on the total Community Development Program, or the extent to which the need for the program is considered urgent or extremely desirable. Programs which are not fundable from other sources but are considered desirable because they appear to be answering an urgent problem, or where the program is experimental, but shows unusual potential for alleviating problems should also be considered.

Category I - Policy Considerations

All programs should be considered in light of the following:

A. Legislative Requirements

Activities must be consistent with Community Development objectives.

- a) the elimination of slums and blight and prevention of deterioration of facilities principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.
- b) the elimination of conditions which are detrimental to health, safety, and public welfare, through code enforcement, demolition, interim rehabilitation assistance and related activities.
- c) the conservation and expansion of the housing stock principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.
- d) the expansion and improvement of the quality and quantity of community services, principally for persons of low- and moderate-income.
- d) a more rational utilization of land and other natural resources.
- f) promotion of diversity of neighborhoods and the revitalization of deteriorated neighborhoods to attract persons of higher incomes.
- g) preservation of properties of special historic, architectural, or aesthetic value.
- h) encourage national urban growth policies consistent with comprehensive local and area-wide development planning.
- i) achievement of the national housing goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

B. City of Oakland Policy Plan

Activities should conform to the applicable statements of local policy.

C. Community Development

Activities should contribute to and be consistent with the broad categories of Community Development activities outlined in Chart 4.

Category II - Factual Considerations

All programs should be tested against the following considerations:

A. Cost Effectiveness

- . Future Costs
- . Total cost divided by life of program.
- . Impact on economic development, employment and income.

B. Timing

- . Need to complete an ongoing program.
- . Lead time needed for planning.
- . Dependency on other programs.
- . Urgency of need.

C. Track Record

- . Qualified and accountable staff.
- . Experience and reputation.

D. Special Considerations

- . Environmental impact implications.
- . Applicability of certain groups which have special problems, e.g., handicapped, women, elderly, unemployed youth.
- . Extent of dependence on another program.

Category III - Budget Review

All program proposals should be submitted to a budget review which would examine the program according to the following criteria. First, a total six-year Community Development budgeting plan should be set, and then individual programs should be considered in light of their relationship with the total program.

- . Projected cost of programs over six-year period compared with six-year plan defined for total Community Development Program.

- . Minimum time needed to complete proposed individual program.
- . Minimum amount of money needed each year to conduct the program over the six years or less.
- . Maximum amount of money needed to complete program.
- . Time sequence of expenditures in accordance with established priorities.
- . Related cost of individual program to total costs at all anticipated programs.
- . Possibility of immediate implementation of program.
- . Compare planning goals to budget requirements.

Category IV - Subjective Considerations

A. Community Consensus

- . Amount of disinterested citizen support.
- . Agreement of beneficial impact.

B. Compatibility with Other Programs

- . Extent to which the program contributes to a well-balanced Community Development Program.
- . Extent to which it duplicates other efforts.
- . Extent to which the program has a multiplier effect on other programs and Community Development objectives.

C. Leveraging Potential

- . Extent to which the program prompts private investment.
- . Extent to which the program prompts other government funds.

D. Performance Standards

- . Length of time project takes to show results.
- . Numbers of persons served at measurable cost.
- . Clear statement of goals.
- . Estimate of numbers of persons to be served.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123308422

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG - 8 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA